


REMARKS

The Examiner has again rejected Claims 1-12, 19-21, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dick et al. (2002/0174340) in view of Schlossberg et al. (2002/0066034). Applicant respectfully disagrees with such rejection.

In previously filed Amendment A mailed July 15, 2004, applicant requested a specific prior art showing of the abundant graphical user interface-related limitations which were added to each of the claims. It was noted, at that time, that none of the prior art references relied upon by the Examiner disclosed such combination of features.

In response, the Examiner has cited the following figure from Krishnaswamy (USPN 5,867,494).



NAI1P093_02.012.01

-11-

However, such excerpt, as well as the remaining Krishnaswamy reference, is clearly lacking. Just by way of example, see the following emphasized limitations below which are present, at least in part, in each of the independent claims.

**“wherein the graphical representation includes a graph;
wherein a selector is displayed for setting a blocking level of the
firewall to a desired blocking level;
wherein a plurality of interface features are displayed including a
summary interface, an Internet protocol (IP) address interface, an event
log, and a notification option interface, wherein:
 upon the selection of the summary interface, displaying a
 recent activity list including total blocked access attempts by remote
 computers,
 upon the selection of the IP address interface, displaying the
 IP address interface for selecting the IP addresses associated with
 the remote computers to be blocked,
 upon the selection of the event log, displaying a log of the
 blocked access attempts by the remote computers, and
 upon the selection of the notification option interface,
 displaying a plurality of notification options for selection;
wherein a lock-down option is provided for selectively blocking all
access attempts via an interface;
wherein a user is capable of performing a visual trace;
wherein the user is capable of selectively blocking Internet control
message protocol (ICMP) traffic;
wherein the user is capable of selecting the IP addresses associated
with the remote computers to be allowed access;**

wherein the user is capable of selecting a list of application programs to be allowed to communicate over a network.”

Such novel combination of limitations are deemed to provide an enhanced firewall system.

It is noted that the Examiner has admitted that Dick and Schlossberg do not specifically mandate that the attempts may be seen via summary pages or pages for specific types of illicit access attempts. Despite such admission, the Examiner continues to invoke Official Notice that it is old and well-known to provide graphical user interfaces that give different viewing options for data, etc. To support such Official Notice assertion, the Examiner has cited Figure 8 from Krishnaswamy above. As noted above, however, such except and the remaining Krishnaswamy reference do not meet such claim limitations, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion.

To this end, the Examiner has not still not satisfactorily satisfied applicant’s request for a specific showing of ALL of the subject matter in ALL of the claims. Note excerpt from MPEP below.

“If the applicant traverses such an [Official Notice] assertion the examiner should cite a reference in support of his or her position.” See MPEP 2144.03.

Further, since a proper prior art showing has still not been made, applicant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, since, for the reasons hereinabove, the prior art references, when combined, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Again, a notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing claimed features, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

NAIIP093_02.012.01

-13-

Still yet, it is noted that the Examiner application of the prior art to the remaining claims is still replete with similar deficiencies. Specifically, the Examiner has rejected Claims 5, 8-12, 14, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dick et al., Schlossberg et al., and Fournel.

After careful inspection of the Examiner's proposed combination of references, there is simply no suggestion of the following emphasized limitations of the claims below, especially when taken in combination with the remaining claim elements:

9. The method as recited in claim 8, wherein the first type of the blocked attempts, the second type of the blocked attempts, and the third type of the blocked attempts are organized into categories.
10. The method as recited in claim 8, wherein a plurality of banned ports associated with the first type of the blocked attempts are displayed with the number of the occurrences associated therewith.
11. The method as recited in claim 8, wherein a plurality of banned IP addresses associated with the second type of the blocked attempts are displayed with the number of the occurrences associated therewith.
12. The method as recited in claim 8, wherein a plurality of banned applications associated with the third type of the blocked attempts are displayed with the number of the occurrences associated therewith.

Again, applicant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the prima facie case of obviousness has not been met, since, for the reasons hereinabove, the prior art references, when combined, fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Again,

a notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of each of the foregoing claimed features, in combination with the remaining claim elements, is respectfully requested.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 505-5100. Applicants are enclosing a check to pay for the added claims. The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P093_02.012.01).

Respectfully submitted,
Zilka-Kotab, PC

Kevin J. Zilka
Registration No. 41,429

P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120
408-505-5100

NAI1P093_02.012.01

-15-